DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 414 EA 022 075

TITLE	Paying for Performance--Important Questions and Answers. The 1989 SREB Career Ladder Clearinghouse Report.
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE	Jan 90
NOTE	36p.; Blue ink on colored paper may reproduce poorly.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Accountability; Career Choice; Career Ladders; Competency Based Teacher Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Incentives; *Job Performance; Mentors; Performance Contracts; Principals; Professional Development; School Districts; School Effectiveness; State Aid; State Programs; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Motivation; Teachers

ABSTRACT

An overview of incentive programs for teachers, administrators, and schools is presented in this report. Topics of discussion include trends in state and local funding, rewards based on teacher performance versus student performance, and program evaluation and outcomes. Discussion findings indicate that the most important and persistent questions concern effects on student learning, on schools, and on the professional appeal of teaching. Third-party evaluations are recommended for local programs supported by state funding. Collegiality among teachers, administrators, and policymakers is crucial for incentive program success. Descriptions of 1989 incentive programs by state and a list of state contacts are included. (13 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Southern Regional Education Board
CAREER LADDER CLEARINGHOUSE

January 1990

ED321414

Paying for Performance — Important Questions and Answers

The 1989 SREB Career Ladder Clearinghouse Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. A. Sullivan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 022 075

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Southern Regional Education Board
CAREER LADDER CLEARINGHOUSE

January 1990

Paying for Performance — Important Questions and Answers

The 1989 SREB Career Ladder Clearinghouse Report

Significant improvements in education do not just happen. They are planned, pursued, and evaluated. Educational improvement is a long-term proposition.

Goals for Education
CHALLENGE 2000
The Southern Regional Education Board

Results. . . performance. . . outcomes — call it what you will but for education it is now a more highly visible priority for the public, governors, legislators, and many educators. What do students know about subjects such as mathematics, reading, and writing, and what can they do with what they know? How many students graduate from high school? How many students are ready for jobs or to go on to college?

Rewards for schools, teachers, and principals are being linked to performance. School incentive programs, which provide additional pay for teachers and principals or money to schools, are more numerous now than three years ago. Tens of thousands of teachers and school administrators continue to be paid thousands of dollars through career ladder or other incentive programs established by over 20 states across the nation. The focus on performance and the link between performance and rewards for schools, teachers, and principals can be seen in actions during 1989.

- The 1989 Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa poll showed that two-thirds of the public favored holding principals responsible for "the school's performance" and that they should be rewarded if the school was "educationally successful." Last year 8 of 10 Americans favored increased pay "for teachers who prove themselves particularly capable."
- The Southern Regional Education Board is promoting 12 specific goals for education that focus on results, such as assuring that: all children are ready for the first grade, 4 out of 5 entering college students are ready to do college-level work, and the dropout rate is reduced by one-half.
- Legislative and state board action in Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, and Vermont set educational goals or called for a focus on performance goals, such as increased student achievement, reduced dropouts, and improved teacher and student attendance.
- Arkansas, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Virginia are creating state level "report cards" to tell the public the results of schooling. Indiana, Illinois, and South Carolina have made such reports for several years; New Jersey just distributed over one million "report cards" to all parents.
- 22 states are funding teacher incentive programs including career ladder and mentor teacher programs. Funding was either increased or remained stable for the programs that have received substantial funding in the past. Five other states have provided, or are scheduled to provide, assistance to develop local incentive programs.

For additional information contact:

Lynn Cornett or
Gale Gaines
Southern Regional Education Board
592 Tenth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30318-5790 (404) 875-9211

EA 022 075

- Seven states (Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, and Washington) have school incentive plans that either provide funding for schools or bonuses to the school personnel. Proposals are pending in Colorado, Maryland, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Virginia.
- The national Education Summit, called by President Bush, focused on goals for education, such as increasing student achievement and reducing dropout rates.
- The nation's governors in their annual *Results in Education* track efforts in education.
- The standards for obtaining certification proposed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards call for performance of the teacher as the major criterion for the advanced status.
- Educators in many districts are designing local programs that focus on the outcomes of schools, for example, the efforts in Dade County (Miami), Florida.
- A "merit schools" program has been proposed in Congress to provide cash incentives to schools that meet the highest standards of excellence.
- Albert Shanker, president of American Federation of Teachers, called for a five-year competition, with $15,000 going to personnel in the top 10 percent of schools.

Questions about performance-based pay or incentive programs continue as states, districts, and schools look for new roles for teachers and school principals that will improve education.

Incentive programs are generally funded on a yearly basis, so each year is a test of the long-term resolve that these programs will improve education. Incentive programs are controversial. Because they deal with fundamental changes in the business of how schools operate and the roles of teachers in schools, they evoke strong positive or negative reactions. Researchers who studied the Utah programs concluded that these strong reactions signaled fundamental changes in school management and instruction.

Reactions to programs may also reflect overall attitudes about how schools operate. Many districts may not be ready or able to put into place a program that requires substantial change in what teachers do and how they are rewarded. Two-thirds of the districts in the Arizona Career Ladder pilot project were not ready to start a career ladder program according to researchers there, who said the organization of these school districts was not effective. The career ladder programs revealed that organization, leadership, and communications were poor. The research claimed that "otherwise intelligent professionals will ultimately sabotage a program because of interpersonal rivalries rather than due to program flaws." On the other hand, Arizona's evaluation of the career ladder project showed that "districts and teachers have made substantial progress in demonstrating positive effects on student achievement" and success in "rewarding and motivating teachers based on performance." Utah found that in districts where district, school, and teacher goals were carefully aligned and there was an approach to managing instruction, the career ladder programs were having the most effect.

SREB's Career Ladder Clearinghouse continues to compile information about incentive programs for teachers, administrators, and schools. The questions that are frequently asked SREB's Career Ladder Clearinghouse include:

- Are states and districts continuing to develop and fund incentive programs?
- Are incentive programs rewarding teachers for what they do or how their students perform?
- What has changed in schools as a result of incentive programs?
- What changes are occurring in the evaluation of teachers?
- What is the long-term outlook for incentive programs?

Funding Incentive Programs

Are states and school districts continuing to develop and fund incentive programs?

Funding for incentive and career ladder programs continues with fairly consistent patterns. States that provided substantial money to establish statewide career ladder or teacher pay programs, such as California, Iowa, Missouri, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah, maintained or increased funding in 1989. Salary supplements in Tennessee's Career Ladder increased to $88 million, up from $85 million last year. (An additional $14 million is allocated for retirement benefits.) In Texas, the state per pupil funding for career ladder programs was raised from $70 to $90, to nearly $300 million for the state's approximately 3.3 million students. Districts provide additional funds. Utah continued funding at $41 million. Iowa's funding continues at $42 million. Missouri increased its funding from $11.3 million to $13 million (districts provide additional revenues for the program). California is fully funding its Mentor Teacher Program at $67 million for 1989-90. South Carolina's Teacher Incentive Program is now statewide, with funding at $21.5 million (the same as 1988-89); its School Incentive Program receives $3.9 million; and the Principal Incentive Program is now a statewide program with funding at $1.35 million (up slightly from last year.

For those states that have funded pilot programs for several years and expanded those pilot projects to additional districts or to additional teachers in districts, such as Arizona and North Carolina, funding for 1989-90 remains the same or has increased. Arizona now has 14 pilot districts (up from the original 7) and has increased funding to $18.3 million from $13.8 million in 1988-89. North Carolina extended its 4-year pilot project by one year, with continued funding of over $40 million. New legislation in North Carolina allows districts to develop differentiated pay plans—one option is the pilot-tested Career Development Plan. Districts may also develop a new program or use a combination of Career Development with another type plan.

Other state-funded pilot projects that were designed to develop models or provide seed money to districts to develop programs have generally done just that. The money provided initially (in the range of $225,000 to about $3 million) is no longer available and local districts are now expected to fund programs. For instance, Delaware and Wisconsin funded development projects for teacher mentor or incentive programs. Illinois funded pilot projects to identify various types of incentive programs that might later be funded by the state; state funding was $600,000 for 1988-89, but there was no funding for 1989-90. Connecticut provided $1 million to districts for planning grants for development of teacher career incentive plans in either 1988-89 or the previous year. In Indiana, a project originally funded at $6 million developed guidelines for districts to develop teacher quality programs (designed to build on a teacher's core salary for being a mentor, showing progress in student achievement, or initiating school improvement projects). Funding for the pilots ended in June 1989. The Department of Education will request money to support a grant program in 1990.

New state-supported projects include Idaho's $3 million that can be used for districts that develop teacher incentive programs as a part of a total package. Indiana and Texas each provided $10 million to fund school incentive programs. Louisiana provided $750,000 to develop school profiles to be used for a school incentive program. Pennsylvania is providing $5 million for the second year of its School Incentive Performance Program. The 1989 Florida legislature funded a new effort called Accountability Program Grants. This program (funded at $10 million) provides grants to high schools that meet statewide indicators, such as improvement in graduation rates or dropout rates. Florida also continues to fund a "merit school" program at $10 million. States with incentive or career ladder plans that have no funding include Georgia (Career Ladder program), Kansas (Internship program), and Rhode Island (Mentor Teacher program).

Focusing on Teachers and Students

Are teachers being rewarded for the work they do or for how their students perform?

In Florida and South Carolina incentive programs have been underway for several years that provide money (either to a school or to school personnel) based on the outcomes of schools and

performance of students. New school incentive programs in Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and Texas will provide money to schools that show desirable outcomes for students.

South Carolina's School Incentive Program, created in 1984, rewards schools that meet criteria which include improvements in student achievement and teacher and student attendance. The achievement criterion must be met for schools to receive awards. Legislation passed in 1989 includes reduction in dropout rates as an additional measure for high schools. By 1993-94, the criteria for schools must include exceptional or improved performance in higher order thinking and problem-solving. The cash awards go to schools, not the personnel in the schools. A school site council composed of teachers, the principal, and parents allocates the funds. Schools are placed in groups based on several factors, including socioeconomic status of the students. Schools that receive incentive awards are eligible to ask for flexibility in state rules and regulations.

The Florida High School Accountability Program created by 1989 legislation will award grants of $10,000 to $75,000 to high schools based on size and the number of indicators that are met by the school. The funds are to be used by the school "to improve productivity, including improvement of student outcomes." Schools are challenged to form partnerships with the community, business leaders, and parents. Accountability indicators include improving the graduation rate, the dropout rate, and the rates of promotion from one grade to another. Also included are indicators of student enrollments in higher level math and science courses and the reduction in the number of the high school's graduates who are placed in remedial studies in the freshman year of a postsecondary degree program. (This information is already reported to high schools through a program with postsecondary institutions in the state.)

The District Quality Instruction Incentive Program continues in Florida with funding of $10 million for 1989-90. This program, created by 1984 legislation, is negotiated at the district level and provides incentive money for schools that exceed expected student achievement. The program is intended to increase performance of students and to provide incentives to school personnel. At least half of the available money (awarded on the basis of student enrollment in the district) must go to school employees at meritorious schools. In addition to schools exceeding student achievement expectations, other standards can include vocational placement, winners of science fairs, student attendance, and parent participation. District programs may also include awards for instructional personnel with outstanding attendance, employment in critical shortage areas or high priority schools, superior performance evaluations, or completion of additional college credits. The State Department of Education provides technical assistance to schools, including several models for determining student achievement progress.

In Pennsylvania, legislation passed in 1988 created the School Performance Incentive Program. In both 1988-89 and 1989-90, $5 million in state funds were appropriated for schools that qualified for incentive awards by showing significant improvement in at least one of three areas: student achievement in reading and mathematics, reducing the dropout rate, and preparing more high school students for higher education. Awards are made on the basis of the number of full-time teachers in the school; schools qualifying in two or all three of the areas are awarded double or triple the base award. Incentive funds are re-invested into the school based on a plan developed by the staff at the school and approved by the school board.

The School Incentive Program under development in Louisiana will initially identify at least 100 schools that have made significant progress based on such factors as test results, dropout rates, and graduation rates. The cash awards, which will go to the schools and are not for salaries of teachers, will be based on school profiles that will be prepared annually on every school and school system.

Indiana's new school incentive program will allow schools to receive cash awards for student improvement in at least two of four identified areas. Currently, $20 million is available; this includes $10 million appropriated for 1988-89 that was not distributed while the program was being developed.

Legislation passed during 1989 in Texas (funded at $10 million over two years) created the Educational Excellence Program to reward gains made in the achievement of schools and school districts and to encourage innovative education programs. Colorado's Excellent Schools Program (under development but not funded) is designed to provide awards to personnel and schools that meet established goals. As part of Georgia's Career Ladder Program, the Group Productivity Program is designed to pay supplements to a school's teachers and administrators. Awards are based on student achievement in a school or school district being greater than would be expected when the socioeconomic characteristics of the students are taken into account. Funding will be considered by the 1990 legislature.

What is not so clear is whether the more recent trend to focus on students and schools and the results of the school as a unit means that there will be less emphasis on rewarding teachers for *what they do* as opposed to *what they produce*—what students learn. Most incentive plans for teachers provide additional money for teaching based on evaluations of teacher performance or on doing more—taking on additional work. While several career ladder or teacher incentive programs include student achievement as a criterion (Arizona, South Carolina, and Utah), other mandates to include student achievement as one criterion in a career ladder or incentive plan have only led to delay in linking student performance to the actions of a single teacher. Although more newly developed programs are focusing on results for students, thousands of teachers continue to receive additional money for how they "perform in the classroom," or if they are "taking on additional work" by assuming duties as lead teachers or mentor teachers.

In North Carolina, for example, legislation passed during the last session continues funding of the Career Development Program for one more year. It provides money for teachers based on evaluations of teaching that determine career level I or II. The legislation also broadens the performance concept by allowing districts to develop differentiated pay plans, with the Career Development Program being an option. If districts choose to participate, they must also be a part of the state accountability plan that focuses on results in the district, but allows flexibility in how to meet and produce better results for students. A comment from one school board member in North Carolina provides one sentiment on the new legislation. "The Career Development Program is a personnel pay plan. The new legislation allows a student performance-based plan."

Evaluation and Outcomes of Programs

What has changed in schools as a result of incentive programs?
What changes are occurring in the evaluation of teachers?

According to several studies, incentive programs are producing positive results for students. Few comprehensive studies have been completed, with the exception of those in Arizona, North Carolina, and Utah. However, both long- and short-term studies continue to support earlier findings showing improved teacher evaluation and increased focus on instruction. Third-party evaluations to examine the implementation and outcomes of various approaches are critical.

One of the most unique approaches to program evaluation has been in Arizona, where the initial legislation establishing the Career Ladder Pilot Project mandated a research program. The pilot project emphasizes the use of student achievement to measure the performance of each teacher. A University of Northern Arizona team of researchers (led by Richard Packard and Mary Dereshiwsky) has been conducting the studies. According to the final findings of a four-year evaluation, districts in the pilot sites are moving toward rewarding and motivating teachers based on performance. The researchers emphasize how critical it is for a district to have an effective organization with good communication channels in place before a program can be implemented. The research notes that in some cases "districts and teachers have made substantial progress in actually demonstrating positive effects on student achievement." A second success relates to the part of the program that adds time and responsibilities to teacher assignments. The study says that this part of the program "enables teachers to move from the isolation of individual classrooms" thus allowing them to take responsibilities in helping the community meet the needs of students.

Other findings of the evaluation note that:

- While all districts have "well-developed program designs," the fact that districts are not all "ready" to implement a program led to difficulties in getting a program underway in some pilot sites.
- Progress in student achievement is a central focus of the program. The research is showing that levels of teacher performance (not college credits or years of experience) account for improvement in student achievement.
- While some districts have achieved the goals of the program through rewarding teachers based on classroom performance and their impact on student achievement, more will need to be done so that all districts can benefit. The study recommends strengthening legislative policy so that each district is held accountable for actually putting in place a program that connects levels of teacher performance and student achievement.
- Third-party evaluation is necessary so that an unbiased profile of a district's strengths and weaknesses can be developed. Flexibility in the amount of time to plan and implement a program is necessary because of differences in the "readiness" of a district.
- Few districts have validly connected teaching performance levels and student achievement. Most evaluation systems deal with teachers' methods rather than accountability for student learning.
- Teachers' satisfaction with the financial reward depends on having an evaluation and reward system that teachers perceive to be equitable. (In other words, the money goes to those with superior teaching performance.)
- Recognition and opportunities to take on duties such as assisting peers is important to teachers.
- The most successful programs have been those in which teachers have been a part of the decisions made about the programs and where the district has good channels of communication.
- Increased focus on the performance of teachers participating in the career ladder program has led to more participation in in-service activities; other teachers "have not moved beyond randomly accumulating college credits and similar activities."

Another example of third-party evaluation that revealed differences in the implementation and operation during a pilot program was in North Carolina. Recommendations from the evaluation of the Career Development Program were that expansion of the program to districts that are not ready to evaluate teachers would require technical assistance for many districts. The Career Development Program, according to the evaluation, demonstrated that the program can be implemented in a variety of school systems and that "teaching and learning are improving" and that " the program has focused attention on effective instruction and staff development."

As reported earlier by the SREB Career Ladder Clearinghouse in a review of third-party evaluations by Carol B. Furtwengler, the Utah Career Ladder provided a way for improving instruction in the schools, but the districts varied in their readiness to gain from the programs.

> "A study, conducted by the Far West Laboratory, reported that the greatest effect of Utah's Career Ladder program was the focus of teachers and principals on more frequent and effective evaluations of teachers. Broad support was found for the program, and there was an expansion of teacher professionalism through the extended contract year and the job-enlargement parts. The extended day program allows teachers to plan, develop curriculum, and improve their skills, while the 'job-enlargement' opportunities allow teachers to become mentors, grade-level chairpersons, or curriculum specialists. The program also provides a powerful mechanism for school improvement activities by creating a more positive climate for learning and for carrying out school and district curriculum planning and management activities. Variation was found, however, in the program's implementation in the school districts.

"Evaluators of the Utah program concluded that there was a need for a long-range commitment to the program and for continued technical assistance from the Utah State Department of Education. The evaluators also recommended that the job-enlargement component be a short-term, temporary feature of the program to permit school districts to be flexible and innovative and to identify differentiated roles and responsibilities on the Career Ladder. Another major recommendation was to keep the performance bonus relatively small and make it a symbol of good teaching that could be earned by more than just a minority of teachers. The researchers felt that rewarding only a few teachers fosters competition and resentment and creates dissension rather than encouraging good teaching."

Other program evaluations, while not as long-term or comprehensive as those in Arizona, Utah, or North Carolina, continue to support the earlier findings that teacher evaluation has improved and that there is more focus on instruction by teachers and principals because of incentive programs.

The Indiana Teacher Quality and Professional Improvement Program, established by legislation in 1985, was funded to develop a plan for a career ladder system, to develop recommendations for pay increases as part of a career ladder system, to look at the implications of collective bargaining on a system, to create programs that provide professional development activities for teachers, and to suggest ways to reward districts for developing cooperative working relationships among teachers. Grants of $8 million were awarded to nearly 200 projects involving 12,000 of the state's teachers. Each program was evaluated. Indiana concluded that a statewide career ladder program was not feasible because no one model emerged as appropriate for all districts. The report noted that "career ladder plans designed locally hold promise. . . and, given assistance, school corporations can develop viable career ladder programs." Local districts were encouraged to review the evaluation for staff based on the performance evaluation models that were developed.

The Fort Bragg, North Carolina, School District developed a Career Development Program for teachers. A key part of the project was to develop new evaluations for teachers that wanted to move to the Career Status II level on the ladder. For the first rung of the ladder (Career Status I), teachers are evaluated on their teaching. In Career Status Level II, teachers are also evaluated on their working with colleagues and in helping the school meet its goals. Teachers are evaluated on providing leadership through curriculum review, being a mentor teacher, sharing knowledge with colleagues, or being a team leader.

An evaluation of the Fort Bragg Career Development Program was recently completed. It showed an increase in student achievement scores and related improved test scores with improved teaching in the classroom. According to the evaluation, "The Career Development Program has been a vehicle through which accomplishments in teaching and school improvement can be rewarded in a meaningful way." In the district a new importance was placed on improving teacher evaluation, principals learned new skills in evaluating teachers, and teachers worked more as committees on subject matter.

States are helping districts design program evaluations and better prepare teachers and principals to solve problems in schools. For instance, the Iowa State Department of Education is assisting districts in evaluating Phase III of the Educational Excellence Program. Phase III involves performance-based pay plans and supplemental pay plans based on additional work assignments or a combination of the two. New educational standards in Iowa call for districts to develop long- and short-term plans for pupil performance. A *Phase III Program Evaluation Sourcebook* provides ideas for districts on how to develop an evaluation model as part of a larger focus on meeting specific goals in the district.

To assist schools in Florida to better implement school improvement projects and to better solve problems through local efforts, the State Department of Education is sponsoring "School Enhancement Institutes" for teams of teachers and the principal from elementary schools across the state. (Legislation in 1985 created the school-focused improvement program to help districts develop their abilities to solve problems through technical assistance in developing

problem-solving approaches and staff training.) Principals and teachers from about 100 schools have received training on identifying successful work patterns identified through extensive research; on locating parent, community, and state resources to help a school; and on designing a plan of action for school improvement. Follow-up activities are designed to encourage teamwork as the plans are implemented.

An initial evaluation of statewide implementation of the South Carolina Teacher Incentive Program, following three years of pilot programs, said that participants: Demonstrate more initiative; plan instruction more carefully; use a wider range of teaching methods; feel they grow professionally; regard performance evaluations by teachers and administrators as appropriate and fair; and many believe the evaluation system has improved because of the teacher incentive programs.

A study of the three-year pilot project and preliminary assessment of the statewide implementation of the South Carolina Principal Incentive Program showed that by 1988-89 principals, both male and female, in all types of schools had equal opportunity to earn an award through the incentive program. Schools that tended to receive school incentive awards (based primarily on achievement of students) were likely to have principals who received awards through the Principal Incentive Program. Principals receive awards of $2,500 to $5,000 based on superior performance and productivity in their schools. South Carolina has plans underway for more comprehensive evaluations of both teacher and principal incentive programs in 1989-90.

The North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction compared student achievement in the 16 districts that participated in the 4-year pilot Career Development Program with that in a matched group of districts in the state. Results on the California Achievement Test Total Battery for grades 3, 6, and 8 over 1985 to 1989 were used. Students in the pilot units made more substantial gains than did students who were not in the pilot units, according to the study. For instance, at grade 3 and 8 the number of pilot units scoring below the national median declined. In the matched units the number declined for grades 6 and 8 but, for grade 3, the number of districts below the national median increased. While results are not consistent, the authors note that the data "suggest an effect of the Career Development Program."

Commitment to Change

What is the long-term outlook for incentive programs?

The questions that SREB's Career Ladder Clearinghouse has highlighted consistently remain the important questions—

Are students learning more?

Have these programs changed schools?

Have these programs made teaching more attractive?

Career ladder, teacher incentive, school incentive—all are programs designed and funded to promote better teaching and improve education for all children. These are the intentions of the many state-funded programs that seek new ways to reward schools and teachers for doing a better job, or for taking on new responsibilities, or for having students who stay in school and learn more.

Evaluations of the programs that have been underway for several years are showing that changes are occurring in: how teachers are evaluated, the focus on results in the classroom for teachers and students, and improved learning. On the other hand, the evaluations continue to point to the difficulties—that teachers are reluctant to take on new roles, that the organization in a school district must be seen as communicating with teachers and including them in substantive ways to plan and implement innovative programs, and that negative reactions to programs and change may be reflections of negative feelings about the workplace. It is clear that not all districts or schools are ready to make changes.

State policy that provides funding for locally developed programs must also find ways to assist districts and to ensure that the intent of the policy is met. Third-party evaluations may be

necessary to provide information to districts about their own organization and how administrators and teachers can work together for a more effective school organization. It cannot be assumed that every district will have the resources or needed working relationships among district administrators and teachers to develop, or more importantly, implement a program that calls on teachers and school principals to focus on results or take on new roles and responsibilities in the schools. However, evaluations, such as those in Iowa, Utah, and Arizona, also show that statewide programs have provided a real way for districts to "network" and share ideas about new methods for the evaluation of teaching and delivering instruction.

The continuing focus on performance of both teachers and schools in the near future seems certain. Millions of dollars are being provided by state legislatures across the nation to fund the development and implementation of school and teacher incentive programs. The policymakers must continue to push and, in fact, demand that comprehensive evaluations are being undertaken to answer the important questions of: *Are students learning more? Are schools changing? Is teaching more attractive?* But policymakers must also be willing to provide stable funding over a long enough period to get results and find ways to help all districts implement programs. On the other hand, teachers and school administrators must be willing to look toward fellow educators for ideas that work and be willing to use their knowledge and expertise to find the best ways to deliver instruction and be accountable for performance.

Selected Resources

Amsler, M. et. al. (1988). *An Evaluation of the Utah Career Ladder System*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Cooney, E. et. al. (1989, August). *Phase III Program Evaluation Sourcebook*. Report submitted to the Iowa Department of Education.

Dorman, A. and Fulford, N. (1989, August). *Incentives Closeup: Profiles of Twenty-One Teacher Incentive Programs*. Elmhurst, Illinois: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Elam, S. and Gallup, A. (1989, September). "The 21st Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 71, pp. 41-54.

Evans, H. (1989). *Final Report of the Teacher Quality and Professional Improvement Program*. Indianapolis: Indiana Department of Education.

Fiske, E. (1989, July 26). "Lessons." *The New York Times*, p. 17.

Furtwengler, C. (1989). *Evaluating Career Ladder/Incentive Programs*. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board.

Furtwengler, C. et. al. (1988, December 31). *Evaluation of North Carolina's School Career Development Pilot Program*. Report prepared for the Joint Legislative Commission on Government Operations, North Carolina General Assembly.

MGT Consultants. (1989, March 27). *An Evaluation of the Teacher Incentive Program 1987-88 Pilot Test Following the Payment of Incentive Rewards and an Initial Assessment of Statewide Implementation of the Teacher Incentive Program in 1988-89*. Report submitted to the South Carolina State Department of Education.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (1989, September). *Student Achievement in Career Development Program Pilot Units 1985-1989*. Report submitted to the North Carolina State Board of Education.

Packard, R. and Dereshiwsky, M. (1989, October 26). *Final Summative Report and Recommendations for Program Modifications of the Arizona Career Ladder Research and Evaluation Project*. Document presented to the Joint Legislative Committee on Career Ladders, Arizona State Capitol.

Packard, R. and Dereshiwsky, M. (1989, November 3). *A Matrix of Legislative Mandates, Research Findings and Policy Recommendations for the Arizona Career Ladder Program*. Document presented to the Joint Legislative Committee on Career Ladders, Arizona State Capitol.

Vance, V. (1989). *Evaluation Report on the Progress of The Career Development Program for 1989-90*. Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Fort Bragg Schools.

INCENTIVE PROGRAMS — 1989

	Local Initiative	Pilots with State Funding and/or Assistance	Full Implementation of State Program	State Program Under Development	Discussion No Legislative Action Pending	Type of Program
Alabama						
Alaska	X					Teacher Incentive
Arizona		X				Career Ladder
Arkansas		(Not funded)				Career Development
California			X			Mentor Teacher
Colorado		X(1)		X(2) (Not funded)		(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Teacher/School Incentive
Connecticut				X		Teacher Incentive Mentor Teacher
Delaware						
Florida			X			School Incentive (2 Programs)
Georgia				X (Not funded)		Career Ladder
Hawaii				X		Mentor Teacher
Idaho				X		Career Compensation Mentor Teacher
Illinois	X					Teacher Incentive
Indiana		X(1)	X(2) X(3)			(1) Career Ladder/ Development (2) Mentor Teacher (3) School Incentive
Iowa			X			Teacher Incentive
Kansas	X					Teacher Incentive
Kentucky		(Completed in 1987)				Career Ladder
Louisiana		X(1)		X(2)		(1) Career Options (2) School Incentive
Maine			X			Tiered Certification
Maryland	X					Career Development Incentive
Massachusetts			X(1)	X(2)		(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
Michigan	X					Teacher Incentive
Minnesota	X(1)	X(2)				(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
Mississippi				(Proposed)		School Incentive
Missouri			X			Career Ladder
Montana	X				X	Teacher Incentive
Nebraska						Teacher Incentive
Nevada	X					Teacher Incentive
New Hampshire	X					Teacher Incentive
New Jersey			X			Teacher Incentive
New Mexico					X	Teacher Incentive
New York	X(1)	X(2)	X(3)			(1) District/School Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher (3) Teacher Incentive
North Carolina		X(1)		X(2)		(1) Career Ladder (2) Differentiated Pay
North Dakota	X					Career Development
Ohio		X		X		Career Ladder
Oklahoma	X			(Proposed)		Teacher Incentive
Oregon		X				Career Development Mentor Teacher
Pennsylvania		X(1)	X(2) X(3)			(1) Career Development (2) Career Development/ Mentor Teacher (3) School Incentive
Rhode Island					X	Mentor Teacher
South Carolina			X(1) X(2) X(3)			(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Principal Incentive (3) School Incentive
South Dakota	X					Mentor Teacher
Tennessee			X			Career Ladder
Texas			X(1)	X(2)		(1) Career Ladder (2) School Incentive
Utah			X			Career Ladder
Vermont				X		Mentor Teacher
Virginia	X	(Completed in 1986)				Career Ladder/ Teacher Incentive
Washington		X(1)	X(2)			(1) School Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
West Virginia					X	Teacher Incentive
Wisconsin	X					Mentor Teacher
Wyoming	X					Career Ladder/ Teacher Incentive

Southern Regional Education Board

Alabama

The Alabama Performance-Based Career Incentive Program, established in 1985 legislation, was repealed in March of 1988. The 1985 legislation called for two phases. Plagued with controversy during Phase I — development and implementation of the evaluation system — and with a tight state fiscal situation, the legislature repealed the program, thus discontinuing the process for statewide evaluation procedures. The career ladder part of the plan, Phase II, was never implemented.

Following the repeal of this law, the Alabama State Board of Education adopted a resolution that requires each local board of education to develop an evaluation system for all professional education personnel. The locally developed evaluation system must be based upon research-based criteria established by the State Board of Education. A task force has developed competencies and indicators to be used in evaluating teachers and administrators. Personnel in specialty areas, such as counselors, speech pathologists, and library media specialists, have been included. Procedures to be used by districts in developing and implementing local systems, based on the competencies, have been completed. The State Department of Education will provide assistance to local districts, and will develop an evaluation system using criteria for districts that do not undertake their own projects. The implementation date for each locally developed professional education evaluation system is the 1991-92 school year. Until the newly developed system is in place, each local board of education is required to continue its current evaluation system.

Alaska

Alaska has no statewide career ladder program. Local districts, however, have the authority to establish such programs. State support has been minimal due to economic limitations.

Alaska is continuing the federally funded Teacher Incentive Grant Program that is aimed at increasing student achievement; $50,000 is available for the program. Approximately one-quarter of the grants available in 1989-90 are directed toward this year's identified education priority area — kindergarten through third grade. The balance of the grants will support educational projects for all grade levels. Projects must include quality student involvement and have potential use by other teachers. While most grants are awarded in the range of $1,000 or less, a few are awarded for up to $2,000.

Arizona

Legislation passed in 1984 through 1986 established a five-year career ladder pilot program and authorized a Joint Legislative Committee (consisting of 10 legislators, 1 educator, 1 member of the State Board of Education, and 1 additional member) to be involved with the approval and monitoring of pilot districts. The committee was also required to make recommendations by January 1, 1988 to the legislature regarding possible statewide program implementation beginning in 1989-90. 1988 legislation expanded the membership of the committee to 15 and delayed for two years the January 1, 1990 deadline date recommended by the committee for statewide implementation of the career ladder program.

A task force appointed by the Joint Legislative Committee is developing a proposal for the continuation and expansion of the career ladder program and will make its recommendations to the full committee by December 1989. Any legislation necessary to implement the recommendations will be addressed during the 1990 legislative session.

As legislated, the pilot program involves the approval and funding of locally designed programs developed in consultation with teachers. Criteria for the projects include procedures that stress assessment of teacher performance, a compensation system based on a completely restructured salary schedule, evidence of teacher support, and a way to show how student achievement would be improved. Currently, 14 districts within the state are implementing career ladder programs — 7 districts began programs in 1985-86, 3 in 1986-87, and 4 in 1987-88. Over 7,000 teachers, nearly 25 percent of the state's teaching force, are involved in the pilot programs. Funding for the program was $13.8 million in 1988-89. The estimated cost for 1989-90 is

$18.3 million. Funds are provided through a formula that is based on student count and on a planned annual percentage increase due to the higher cost of teachers moving up the ladder.

Arkansas

Efforts in Arkansas over the past year have included developing an indicators system that will provide information about the performance of school districts and schools. The legislation known as the *School Report Cards Act* was passed during the 1989 legislative session. It calls for an office of accountability to be established within the Department of Education that would issue an annual report. An advisory group is working on guidelines for the project.

Recommendations by the Arkansas Business Council, in a report released in September 1988, call for any major pay increase to include a performance-based pay plan. The report also recommends state support for districts that adopt "innovative organizational structures and methods of teaching." In addition, it encourages performance-related educational goals for schools.

The governor's 1988 proposal, *Moving Arkansas Forward into the 21st Century,* calls for raising teacher salaries, establishing a uniform minimum teacher salary structure, and funding incentives or career development opportunities for teachers. The report recommends that districts, once they have complied with a minimum salary schedule, design performance-based systems. Special consideration should be given to plans that are tied to improvement in student performance, according to the recommendations. The Board of Education, in consultation with other groups, is called upon to develop criteria to identify and reward exemplary teaching.

The report recommends planning grants to schools to develop school-wide restructuring that would include redefining teacher roles and responsibilities by providing career options, such as serving as mentor teachers or leaders in curriculum development. Schools would then receive grants of approximately $30,000 a year over a three- to five-year period, with districts assuming more of the costs over time.

In 1985, the governor appointed a Teacher Career Development Commission to make grants to school districts for locally-developed projects. The program has not received funding, although plans were submitted by several districts.

California

The California Mentor Teacher Program, created in 1983, is intended to upgrade the skills of experienced as well as new teachers and encourage retention of exemplary teachers through the selection of "mentor teachers" who are designated to spend part of their time working with new and experienced teachers.

Individual school districts and county offices voluntarily participate in the mentor program. The legislation establishing this program allows districts broad latitude in designing, implementing, and evaluating their individual mentor programs. The intent is that each district develop a program tailored to the particular needs of its staff.

State law authorizes districts to designate up to 5 percent of their certified teachers as mentors; state funds, however, had not been sufficient until 1988-89 to fully support the statutory limit. Funding and participation have increased significantly since the program was initiated. In 1984-85, the first full year of implementation, a $30.8 million appropriation supported 4,362 designated mentors in 742 districts. This financed 2.84 percent of the teachers in the state. In 1987-88, $49.75 million was available to support 8,273 teachers, approximately 4 percent of the state's teachers. State funds in 1988-89 were sufficient to allow the statutorily authorized 5 percent participation level for the first time in the history of the program — approximately $63.5 million was appropriated for 10,563 mentor teachers. For 1989-90, $67 million was appropriated to again fully fund the program and to increase the mentor stipend to $4,186 (from $4,000) and the district support allowance to $2,093 (from $2,000) per mentor.

The State Department of Education is now in the process of planning a 3- to 5-year informal review of the program.

Colorado

As a part of the Educational Quality Act of 1985, a two-year research and development project was funded to improve educational quality. Under this program, 20 pilot projects were provided support to research and test the value of innovative programs to advance teaching. The projects addressed such issues as career ladders, mentor teacher programs, career enrichment, and performance incentives. The Department of Education's final report on the program in August 1987 concluded that a statewide approach to the issue of incentives was not feasible for Colorado. It recommended that the state should coordinate the development of guidelines for teacher advancement and recognition that would allow for local district variations, and that local districts should establish opportunities for the advancement, recognition, and compensation of teachers within those state guidelines.

During the 1988 session, the legislature passed a law allowing local districts to design and implement pilot alternative salary policies using criteria that could include performance, additional duties and responsibilities, and additional time requirements. The Department of Education is responsible for reviewing pilot proposals submitted by the districts, providing assistance to districts implementing pilot programs, and disseminating information about these projects statewide. No state funds have been provided for this purpose—districts participating must finance the alternative salary policies from existing operating funds. No districts have submitted proposals.

Another program established by the 1988 legislature is the Excellent Schools Program, the purpose of which is to provide financial awards to personnel, schools, and districts that demonstrate outstanding performance in achieving established goals. No state funds were appropriated for the program; however, the Department of Education was authorized to receive contributions to fund the financial awards. Contributions will be solicited once the State Board of Education adopts standards for the awards.

Connecticut

In January 1987, legislation was signed into law by the governor that addressed increases in minimum salaries for teachers (to $20,000), professional development, teacher evaluation, and teacher career incentives programs. Under this law, the Connecticut Department of Education provided grants to assist local and regional boards of education and regional educational service centers in developing new or revising existing teacher evaluation programs. Grants were also provided to plan teacher career incentive programs. The development of career incentive programs could include compensation related to factors other than seniority and academic degree; the naming of mentor and cooperating teachers; curriculum development; peer assessment; peer counseling; master teachers; a career advancement ladder; and the consideration of performance, experience, job-related education, and advanced academic training.

The teacher evaluation and the career incentives development programs each received $1 million in funding for planning grants to be made either in 1987-88 or 1988-89 (districts could apply for funds in one year or the other but not in both). Additionally, $3 million was provided for the implementation of teacher evaluation programs in 1988-89. Due to fiscal constraints, the legislature did not fund the department's request for $3 million in teacher evaluation implementation funds in 1989-90. However, $1 million was provided for professional development grants—districts continuing their programs are doing so through this grant program and local funding.

In an attempt to link the teacher evaluation, professional development, and career incentive programs as an integrated career improvement effort, school districts were permitted, beginning in 1988-89, to file a single grant application for all three programs. In keeping with the idea, it is anticipated that the Department of Education will recommend to the legislature in a January 1990 report that a single career development grant program be created to provide funds to districts in these three areas.

The $8 million *Beginning Educator Support and Training* (BEST) program is being implemented this year after three years of development and field-testing. About 500 beginning

teachers will be evaluated six times during this year and are paired with a trained mentor teacher. When the program is fully implemented, it is anticipated that 1,200 to 1,600 new teachers will participate annually.

Delaware

Early efforts in Delaware focused on career ladder and other incentive programs. Funds were appropriated in 1985 for the development and implementation of a career ladder program. When agreement on a program could not be reached, the funds were used to develop teacher training models and to implement a statewide appraisal system. The focus then turned to professional development for teachers and principals—teachers are trained in the elements of effective teaching and principals, in supervision and evaluation fundamentals.

Florida

The District Quality Instruction Incentives Program continues with funding of $10 million for 1989-90. This program, created by 1984 legislation, is negotiated at the district level and provides incentive money for schools that exceed expected student achievement.

The goals of the program are to increase performance of students and to provide incentives to school personnel. At least half of the available money (awarded on the basis of student enrollment in the district) must go to school employees at meritorious schools. In addition to schools exceeding student achievement expectations, other standards can include vocational placement, winners of science fairs, student attendance, and parent participation. District programs may also include awards for instructional personnel with outstanding attendance, employment in critical shortage areas or high priority schools, superior performance evaluations, or completion of additional college credits. The State Department of Education provides technical assistance to schools, including several models for determining student achievement progress.

In Florida the High School Accountability Program, created by 1989 legislation and funded at $10 million, will award high school grants of $10,000 to $75,000 based on size and number of indicators that are met by the school. The funds are to be used by the school "to improve productivity, including improvement of student outcomes." Schools are challenged to form partnerships with the community, business leaders, and parents to meet the student outcome indicators. Indicators include improving: the graduation rate, the dropout rate, and the rates of promotion from one grade to another. Also included are indicators of student enrollments in higher level math and science courses and the reduction in the number of the high school's graduates who are placed in remedial studies in the freshman year when they enter a postsecondary degree program. (This information is already reported to high schools through a program with postsecondary institutions in the states.)

Additional incentive programs for teachers and administrators include a Teacher of the Year Program with the Teacher of the Year receiving $2,500 from state funds and $10,000 from Burdines, a corporate sponsor of the program. Local and regional winners were awarded $500 from the state and $750 from Burdines. The Florida Commissioner of Education also created the Principal Achievement Awards. Principals are chosen on the basis of several criteria of excellence, such as increasing student performance; encouraging positive, innovative teaching; utilizing community resources; and creating positive school climates. Eighteen principals were recognized last year.

At the district level, the 1986 contract of the United Teachers of Dade and the Miami-Dade County School District contained provisions for the Professionalization of Teaching Force that included a career ladder plan, special assignments for teachers, and a teacher recruitment and intern plan. The contract was part of the continuing emphasis begun by the district in 1974 to move to school-based management and shared decision-making at the school level. The four-year district project, School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making is "more than just budget decentralization." It includes curriculum planning and colleague decision-making. In 1979, state legislation established the school as the unit of accountability, provided for training of principals as school-based managers, and appropriated funds for the study of school-based

management. The pilot program in Dade County does not depend on additional funding. Each school receives a lump sum of about $3,400 per student. The teachers' union and the school board have agreed to waive district rules or contract regulations, if necessary.

Georgia

The Career Ladder Program, developed in response to 1985 legislation, was piloted in five systems during the 1988-89 school year. Funding for implementation in approximately 32 school systems is being sought from the 1990 General Assembly. The State Board of Education approved policy formally establishing the Georgia Career Ladder Program in its August 1989 board meeting, subject to funds. If the program for teachers is judged successful, future plans call for career ladder programs for all professional staff.

In addition, funds are being sought for the Group Productivity Program. It will pay supplements to entire faculties if student achievement in the school or school system exceeds what would be expected when socioeconomic characteristics of students are taken into account. The program is designed to reward cooperation among staff for effective instruction. Awards range from $125 to $600; certified staff and instructional aides in schools and each central office are included.

The Georgia Career Ladder Program for Teachers provides for a three-year appraisal in four areas:

- Classroom performance, in terms of the teacher's on-the-job performance as a professional;
- Teacher productivity, in terms of academic achievement of students;
- Professional service, such as professional activities that help other educators;
- Professional growth, a teacher's own efforts to personally improve as an educator.

Teachers who volunteer to be appraised develop a three-year Professional Development Plan that is reviewed for approval by a district-wide review team comprised of teachers and others. Successful appraisal results in a three-year promotion that establishes the teacher's eligibility for an incentive award and the opportunity to add days to the standard 190-day contract. Days may be added if the teacher engages in approved extra duties and responsibilities.

The program has several features. First, the amount of funds that a participating school system receives for paying career ladder supplements is based to a large degree on the productivity of the school system as measured by the Georgia Statewide Testing Program after adjustment for socioeconomic factors known to affect student test performance. Second, the selection of teachers is not restricted by a quota or limit but by performance standards or anchors established by the plan approved by the local school system. Systems must give career ladder status and incentive awards to all teachers who volunteer for appraisal and who qualify for career ladder status. Third, the level of supplement is based on the salary increase necessary to make mid-career teacher salaries comparable to mid-career professionals in professions/occupations whose entry requirements are similar to those in education. For instance, an experienced teacher at the top level of the career ladder who works a 230-day contract could earn a supplement of $18,500, based on 1989 salary analysis of salaries for non-education jobs such as an accountant or software programmer.

Hawaii

A number of programs implemented in Hawaii have offered incentives for teachers to relocate to remote areas of the state or to supervise pre-service instruction. The alternative certification program, originally limited to mathematics and science, has been extended to address teacher shortages in counseling and special education. This program allows current teachers as well as persons with undergraduate degrees in the shortage areas to seek certification in those areas.

Following pilot mentor teacher programs in several districts, the State Department of Education is planning to submit a budget request to the legislature to initiate a statewide program during the 1991-93 biennium. As a measure to retain new teachers, the Department will request about $2.5 million for support personnel for beginning teachers.

Other initiatives that encourage professional growth include staff development programs for teachers and administrators funded at nearly $2.1 million and $218,271, respectively. The appropriated funds are prorated to districts based upon teacher units; individual schools then submit development plans to the districts for funding. An education-business partnership effort places teachers and school administrators in 4- to 6-week summer internships at local businesses where they can acquire new job perspectives and skills in planning, staff development, and community relations. The interns are paid between $1,000 and $1,500 by the businesses for their participation. In June 1990, a federally funded summer internship program will be implemented. Teachers and school administrators will be assigned to state and district offices for two months to receive work experience in areas such as curriculum and instructional services, personnel services, business services, planning, budgeting, and public relations. Participants will be paid approximately $2,000.

Idaho

Legislation enacted in 1984 permitted school districts to participate in the Teacher Excellence Program; $100,000 was appropriated for administration and assistance to local districts in developing career compensation plans in fiscal 1985, with the expectation that these plans would be implemented during the following year. While the 1985 legislature did not appropriate the funding for local career compensation plans due to economic considerations, $90,000 was provided to the State Department of Education to continue a local district assistance program, with a verbal commitment to address the career ladder issue in upcoming legislative sessions.

The 1989 legislature did address the issue by appropriating $3 million for programs that attract and retain quality teachers. The funds are to be used to support a minimum teacher salary of $16,000, to implement career compensation plans developed as a result of the 1985 funding, and for the development and implementation of compensation plans in those districts that do not currently have such plans. $500,000 was also appropriated to implement an educator mentor program where districts will receive $1,000 for each first-year teacher and administrator to assist first-year personnel.

Illinois

The Education Reform Act of 1986 authorized the establishment of a Center for Excellence in Teaching within the State Board of Education to conduct a study of teacher career compensation programs based on merit. The State Board of Education was authorized to fund five to seven pilot programs in local districts; $1 million was allocated for the implementation phase during 1986-87.

The pilot programs were designed to identify, from an array of various types, compensation programs that the General Assembly might then extend on a statewide basis. Proposals were solicited from all Illinois school districts; 30 proposals were received, all of which were developed by the school districts in conjunction with their teachers and a participating university. In March 1986, seven districts, representing a diverse collection of sizes and types and with programs offering a variety of approaches to the compensation issue, were awarded grants to continue developing plans for implementation. Funding for the pilots was scaled down in 1987-88—the $800,000 provided supported the continuation of five of the pilots. The same five continued during 1988-89 with $600,000. No funds were appropriated to continue the pilot projects in 1989-90; however, the State Department of Education is planning to share the results of the projects so that local districts can incorporate them into their own initiatives.

Indiana

The State Department of Education developed a plan in response to 1985 legislation requiring the State Superintendent of Education to determine the feasibility of a career ladder plan and to develop methods to honor, recognize, and provide professional growth for teachers. The four-year Teacher Quality and Professional Improvement Program, completed in June, involved pilot projects primarily in career ladder and career development areas. Of the 181 pilot projects, 158 were funded under career development, 9 under career ladder, and 14 in other areas.

The career ladder pilots generally involved additional pay for teachers who assumed additional responsibilities. Two of the plans developed are currently operating at the local level. The career development plan involved five major approaches to providing opportunities to teachers: in-service programs, mini-grants to teachers, mentoring, collaborative decision-making (teachers participated in the decision-making process), and outcome-based education (students progressed from one instructional unit to another as significant progress was achieved).

Since the project did not officially conclude until June, the Department of Education presented a draft of its final report to the 1989 legislature. The Department concluded that local districts should be encouraged to develop and implement career ladder and career development programs based upon their individual needs, and that the state should provide assistance and information to districts. To do this, the Department is proposing the creation of a Professional Development Grant program to support local initiatives. Funding will be requested during the 1990 legislative session; however, it is not anticipated that funds will be available until 1991 due to the state's biennial budgeting cycle.

Beginning in 1988-89, all districts were required to have a mentor teacher program in which new teachers participate as a condition for certification. For 1989-90, $2 million was appropriated to support the program. From these funds, mentor teachers are paid $600 per year and the districts receive $200 per mentor to provide release time.

Indiana is initiating a school incentive program authorized by the legislature in 1987. Schools will receive cash awards for student improvement in at least two of four areas (performance on the state progress exam, language arts test scores, mathematics scores, and attendance rates). A total of $20 million is available for awards in 1989-90; this includes $10 million appropriated for 1988-89 that was not distributed while procedures for implementing the program were developed.

Iowa

Legislation enacted in 1987 established the Educational Excellence Program consisting of three major phases addressing the recruitment of quality teachers; the retention of quality teachers; and improving the quality, effectiveness, and performance of teachers.

Phase I establishes a minimum teacher salary of $18,000 for all teachers; Phase II provides district and area education agency (AEA) boards of directors with funds to improve salaries above the minimum; and Phase III promotes excellence through the development of performance-based pay plans and supplemental pay plans based on additional work assignments or specialized training. Each district and AEA choosing to participate in Phase III is required to appoint a committee of administrators, teachers, parents, and other interested individuals to develop a proposal relating to performace-based pay, supplemental pay, or a combination of the two.

Of the 1989-90 Phase III plans, 271 districts (63 percent) implemented a supplemental pay plan for additional instructional work or specialized training; 150 districts (35 percent) implemented a combination supplemental and performance-based pay plan; and 8 districts implemented a plan based on performance only. A total of 360 districts (84 percent of those participating) either established a local committee to conduct a study of performance-based pay or actually implemented a performance-based pay plan in the first year. (A number of legislators and the governor have expressed particular interest in looking at performance-

based pay.) Since 1987-88, plans including performance-based pay have increased over 180 percent, from 56 to 158 districts.

The legislature appropriates $92 million annually for the Educational Excellence Program. Of this amount, approximately $42 million is available for Phase III plans. Allocations are based on an enrollment formula.

In early 1989, the Department of Education presented a report to the legislature based on the first-year annual reports that were due on October 1, 1988. The Department found that districts and AEAs needed to strengthen the evaluation of their Phase III plans. To assist in this area, the Department developed the "Phase III Program Evaluation Sourcebook" and conducted a workshop in early August.

Kansas

The Kansas State Board of Education and the legislature have adopted the position that teacher incentive programs should be developed and funded at the local level. A pilot internship program designed to improve the quality of teachers entering the profession was funded at $225,000 in 1988. No funding was provided for 1989-90.

Kentucky

Under court order, the General Assembly is currently developing a new plan for the schools of the state. The schools were declared unconstitutional and are to be reworked from the ground up. The General Assembly has appointed a committee that is currently working on a new plan for the schools. Curriculum, funding, and school governance are the major areas in which the committees are working. A new plan is to be ready by June of 1990.

1984 legislation provided for a pilot program to field-test evaluation procedures for a career ladder program; the project was funded for one year. The classroom observation instrument developed in the field was to be piloted during the 1988-89 school year for use in the state teacher internship program. The internship for first-year teachers is a State Board of Education program.

University researchers worked with school personnel in revising and developing the system that is now being used in the internship program for first-year teachers.

Louisiana

Louisiana's 1988 legislation, the "Children First" education reform package, called for two incentive programs—the School Profile and Incentive Program and the Model Career Options package. Data collection for the School Progress Profiles begins with the 1989-90 school year, and the first profile report for each school and district is scheduled to be issued in the winter of 1990. The School Incentive Program is under development; the first award recipients will be identified and notified in the winter of 1991 after two years of data have been compiled for Profiles. The Model Career Options Program will be piloted for the next two years and implemented in the 1991-92 school year.

These programs are part of a package that raised teacher salaries, extended the state salary schedule to include 25 years of experience, and established evaluation procedures for the performance of teachers as a part of continuing certification.

The School Profile and Incentive Program (funded at $750,000 for development costs in 1989) calls for the creation of profiles of schools, including test results, dropout rates, graduation rates, students in Advanced Placement classes, expenditures, and other information. The profiles, approved by the Board of Education, will be prepared annually on every school and school system. The School Incentive Program is designed to reward schools making significant progress and to increase local accountability. At least 100 schools will be initially identified as having made progress (schools will be grouped into similar categories based on such factors as socioeconomic status of students, size of school, and urban or suburban location). The cash

awards will be used for instruction, not to increase salaries. School councils of teachers, community members, and students will assist the principals in determining use of the award.

The Model Career Options will provide teachers with salary bonuses for performance and advancement, and provide opportunities to take on new and expanded responsibilities. In a pilot project in 1989-90 the State Department of Education will provide guidelines on options that might be included in district programs. A statewide committee has been appointed to advise on the development of the program. The compensation is yet to be determined but is to be between 10 and 20 percent of the state minimum salary received by each teacher on the state salary schedule. The program is to be voluntary for teachers who have 7 years of experience, hold at least a master's degree, and have a superior evaluation under the statewide evaluation system now being developed.

Maine

As a result of legislation adopted in 1984, a certification pilot study was conducted by 20 school districts from April 1984 through December 1986. The law established three levels of certification — a two-year provisional certificate for beginning teachers, a renewable five-year professional certificate, and a master teacher certificate. Under the law, beginning teachers serving the two-year provisional term are supervised and evaluated by support systems consisting primarily of teachers; evaluation criteria include professional classroom skills and subject matter knowledge. After successfully completing the provisional term, the teachers will be granted the professional certificate. Professional teachers are eligible to apply for a master teacher certificate.

Following a 1987 legislative attempt to eliminate the master teacher level of certification (the governor vetoed the bill), the State Board of Education adopted procedures for the statewide implementation of the certification program, standards for the support systems, and a process for appeals pertaining to applications for the issuance and renewal of certificates. The certification program took effect on July 1, 1988. All districts now have support systems that are providing the State Department of Education with recommendations for certification renewals.

A certification task force has been appointed to continue to examine the impact of the new certification regulations on local school districts and on institutions of higher education in the state.

Maryland

Incentive programs for teachers and administrators are continuing to develop at the local level. Legislation in 1984 enabled districts to receive state education aid to develop programs for improving teacher performance.

The Teacher Plus program in the Frederick County Schools provides release time for teachers during the contracted year to work on the professional development within their own school building. The program is reported to be highly successful. Carroll County schools provide differential pay for duties such as team leader or department chair; rankings for administrative positions are also given. Harford County schools have implemented a program to recognize elementary school teachers for significant and unique types of curriculum activities and projects. The program provides both monetary awards to teachers and ways to share the exemplary projects with elementary schools.

The Governor's Commission on School Performance has issued a report that calls for a comprehensive system of public accountability in which each school, school district, and the state are "held responsible for student performance." It recommends an accreditation system that uses information from parents and students, the school's teachers and administrators, and a review of educators from other systems. The focus will be on how successful the school is in showing results for each student. Incentives and sanctions to schools and districts will be based on performance.

Massachusetts

The Public School Improvement Act of 1985 established a far-reaching program of educational reform that included several types of teacher incentive programs. The act called for a minimum teacher's salary of $18,000, and state funding to pay for some of the educational expenses of those who agree to teach within the state after their graduation. The legislation also established the "Horace Mann Teacher" designation and the Lucretia Crocker Exemplary Education Program. Under the former, the Board of Education developed guidelines for establishing programs with expanded duties for teachers, including responsibilities for training teachers, developing curricula, providing special assistance to potential dropouts, and serving as in-service instructors or consultants. Subject to collective bargaining, school committees designate the Horace Mann teachers on the basis of criteria supplied by the State Board of Education. Each school district may apply for a grant equivalent to $120 per teacher; maximum extra compensation for each Horace Mann teacher is $2,500. Legislation was passed during the 1988 session to increase these amounts, but the state's finances have not permitted the increases to take effect.

The Lucretia Crocker program was created to award teacher fellowships to develop, replicate, and disseminate exemplary educational programs that have been successful in advancing academic and creative achievement and creating a better school climate. Exemplary programs nominated in January 1986 were implemented in the 1986-87 fiscal year. Currently, 15 fellows are being supported with an appropriation of $504,000.

Following recommendations made by the Joint Task Force on Teacher Preparation, the Department of Education is in the process of revising certification requirements to encompass a two-stage program leading to full certification. The first stage will involve completing a bachelor's degree in liberal arts to receive a provisional certificate. The second stage is a two-year program during which time provisionally certified teachers will complete a master's degree and be under the guidance of a mentor teacher. The Department is currently developing regulations to implement these requirements, which are to become effective July 1, 1994.

Michigan

Currently, there is no state-level effort toward establishing performance-based programs for teachers and administrators. There is, however, proposed legislation under consideration that would require each district to develop a school improvement plan. These plans could involve teacher incentives. While legislation is pending, funds have been appropriated to begin supporting the development of school improvement programs. Each school in the state receives $640 from a $2.25 million state appropriation to begin planning. Those schools more advanced in the planning process can receive up to $50,000 from a $2 million appropriation to begin implementing improvement programs.

For 1989-90, nearly $1.9 million was appropriated to update teachers' knowledge in their content areas. These funds may be used to pay college tuition for certified teachers. Additionally, $3 million in state funds has been allocated to the districts for local professional development programs during the current year.

Minnesota

A law passed in 1987 created a teacher mentoring task force to make recommendations for a system of state and local incentives for teachers and to develop guidelines and procedures for a mentor teacher competitive grant program. For the 1987-89 biennium, $500,000 was appropriated for mentor teacher grants; 11 grants were awarded. For the 1989-91 biennium, $500,000 was again provided to continue the pilots, disseminate materials from these pilots, and provide training to other interested districts.

Mississippi

Mississippi's *BEST (Better Education for Success Tomorrow)* is a report recently developed at the urging of the governor and after meetings with community groups, business groups, educators, and legislators throughout the state. The report says that the people of Mississippi are demanding change. "They want to see clear goals and long-term vision. They want to see a focus on students and student learning. They require that rewards be related to results." The report recommends that the funding of education include incentives that reward excellence. Education reform will be considered during the 1990 legislative session.

Increasing teacher salaries has been a priority in the state. Teachers in the state were evaluated during the 1987-88 school year to receive an additional $1,000 pay bonus. The increase was the third part of a three-year pay raise, mandated by 1985 legislation. In 1988, the legislature adopted a two-year plan to increase teacher salaries by an average of $3,800. Raises were to range from $2,000 to $6,000, depending upon certification level.

The State Board of Education re-emphasized its position that all teachers who did not go through the state evaluation process must be at proficiency level or above to receive pay increases.

Missouri

In April 1986, the State Board of Education approved a career ladder model and guidelines for the development of individual district plans. The model was developed by an advisory committee appointed by the State Board as a result of a 1985 education reform act. The model consists of three stages, each of which contains a set of predetermined criteria. Both district and teacher participation is voluntary; however, should a district decide to participate, it must guarantee local funds to supplement an allocation made by the state in reaching the state-specified salary supplement levels: $1,500 — Stage I; $3,000 — Stage II; $5,000 — Stage III. District plans must conform to the state model and guidelines.

Funding and participation has steadily increased since the program began. In 1986-87, 2,369 teachers, librarians, and counselors in 63 school districts qualified to reach Stage I. The state provided $2.6 million to support the first year of implementation. For 1987-88, $7.3 million was appropriated and about 5,000 participants in 120 school districts received salary supplements. About 6,000 participants in 150 districts were eligible to receive supplements in 1988-89, with state funding of $11.4 million. It is anticipated that 177 districts and 7,000 teachers, counselors, and librarians will participate in the career ladder this year at a cost to the state of $13 million.

Montana

During 1985-86, an experimental program was implemented to identify teachers with the potential of becoming principals and to assist these teachers in completing certification requirements. The selected teachers may act in the capacity of principal under supervision for a period of up to three years while working toward certification. A similar program was initiated in 1987-88 for those certified teachers seeking their special education endorsement. While completing the requirements, a person may teach in special education under supervision for up to one year. In 1988-89, a program for teachers interested in becoming guidance counselors was introduced.

The newly elected governor's "New Century Plan" calls for the Board of Public Education to address several issues including incentive pay. The Board has developed a study plan and will report to the governor and legislature on its recommendation in June 1990.

Nebraska

Provisions for a career ladder were enacted by the legislature in 1984 as part of the governor's omnibus education improvement bill. The legislature postponed the implementation date twice. In 1987 legislation, the implementation date was removed from law and a provision was added that made initiation of the program dependent upon funding. Funding has not been provided to the Department of Education for development and implementation of the program.

Nevada

The Committee on School Improvement Through Incentives, in an April 1985 report directed to legislators and state and local education agency personnel, recommended that local districts be encouraged to develop various kinds of incentive programs with state funding. However, no legislation has been enacted, no funding has been provided, and there are no plans for a statewide initiative.

New Hampshire

The New Hampshire educational system is decentralized and is primarily financed with local funds. The State Board of Education has encouraged local districts to adopt compensation and incentive plans for teachers; however, any action taken is strictly a matter of local option. Currently, a few districts are experimenting with some form of incentive program. The State Board of Education is continuing to monitor their efforts.

New Jersey

A number of initiatives to improve the teaching profession continue in New Jersey. Currently, all teachers are guaranteed a minimum salary of $18,500. The Governor's Teacher Grant Program, funded at $500,000 for 1989-90, provides awards of up to $15,000 each for teachers to develop creative model programs and $3,000 grants to districts adopting these models. The Governor's Teacher Recognition Program involves an annual public ceremony for one outstanding teacher from each public school. The $2.2 million in funding provides $1,000 grants to each teacher's district to be expended as designated by that teacher. The Governor's Teaching Scholars Program, designed to attract 160 talented high school students annually to teaching by providing up to $30,000 in forgivable scholarship loans, failed to receive funding to offer awards to the new entering class. The Department of Education will seek funds in its 1990-91 budget request to offer the scholarships to high school students graduating in 1990.

Other continuing efforts include the Commissioner's Symposium for Outstanding Teachers (100 teachers are selected to attend a three-day summer retreat to exchange ideas with other state educators), the Academy for the Advancement of Teaching and Management (trains teams of teachers and principals in proven techniques of instruction and instructional supervision), and the Minority Teacher Program (aimed toward attracting promising minority high school students into the teaching profession).

New Mexico

In 1985, the legislature requested continued study of performance-based pay systems, but declining state revenues continue to undermine efforts to initiate incentive programs. The governor is interested in establishing pilot performance-based pay programs in school districts, however, it is unlikely that the legislature will be receptive to such programs in light of the revenue outlook.

New York

The legislature has continued to fund a number of programs designed to strengthen the teaching profession. In 1989-90, an appropriation of $158.4 million will provide teachers with salary increases based on their length of service. The $12.5 million Mentor Teacher-Internship Program, now in its fourth year and due to be fully implemented statewide in 1993, provides first-year teachers with guidance, support, and leadership from their more experienced colleagues. Teachers and other school personnel are assisted in increasing their ability to meet the educational needs of their students through the $17.5 million teacher resource and computer training centers. The Teacher Opportunity Corps, funded at $1.7 million in its third year of operation, attracts potential teachers into working with "at-risk" students. $4 million is available through the Empire State Challenger Scholarship and Fellowship programs for students preparing to teach in shortage areas. The Teacher Summer Business Employment program provides incentives to private employers for hiring teachers during the summer with its $5.8 million appropriation.

In Rochester, the Career in Teaching Program is being implemented. A 1988 career options agreement between the Rochester City School District and the Rochester Teachers Association enables teachers to remain in the classroom and to assume different duties for part of the day. The contract increased salaries, added days to the teaching contract, moved away from a pay scale based solely on years of experience and degrees, and included school-based planning committees. The program involves a career ladder and incorporates the district's Peer Assistance and Review Program, first implemented in 1986. It is overseen by a joint panel of ten members; five appointed by the teacher's organization and five by the superintendent.

The Peer Assistance and Review Program provides internships for new teachers and intervention to tenured teachers who need assistance. The career ladder has four steps: intern, resident, professional, and lead teacher. Lead teachers not only serve as mentors but also work as demonstration teachers, coordinators for staff development, and heads of special projects. They are selected by the joint panel, must have 10 years of experience in Rochester, and must remain in teaching 60 percent of their time. Currently 46 of the district's 2,500 teachers have been designated as lead teachers.

North Carolina

School year 1988-89 was the fourth (and final) year of North Carolina's Career Development Plan pilot effort. In 1988-89, $47 million was spent on this pilot effort, with 83 percent of the money going to program participants as salary incentives or extra pay. The other 17 percent was spent on program salaries (project coordinator and observer/evaluators in each district), staff development, and travel. According to staff, a number of technical issues raised by the pilot effort were resolved, and a number of issues about the future of the project were raised.

Within the 16 participating school districts, 38 percent of the teachers (N = 6,235) were at Career Status II. These persons were paid 15 percent more than their base salary and were afforded opportunities to participate in the Extra Pay for Additional Responsibilities portion of the Plan. An additional 39 percent were at Career Status I, with 20 percent in the Initial Certification Program. Only 3 percent of employees in the pilot districts declined to participate in the program.

While personnel evaluation activities continued to be important in the program, the local districts devoted a large amount of their attention to the implementation of their Extra Pay programs. Although each district was responsible for developing its own plan, these could be categorized into one of three kinds. In some districts, a role-centered program provided extra pay for teacher mentors, department chairs, grade team leaders, and similar leadership roles. Other units opted for a project-based plan, in which teachers proposed innovative curricular/instructional activities (presenting Saturday learning fairs, correlating achievement data to curriculum, developing learning kits). These proposals were then ranked and funded. A third category combined payment for *some* roles (usually mentor-teacher) and reserved some funds to support special projects.

Within the pilot units, a number of evaluative studies were completed. A third-party evaluation of the project, funded by the General Assembly, found that programatically the pilot had been successful, but pointed to areas requiring further refinement (administrative evaluation, ongoing monitoring). Studies conducted by Department of Public Instruction staff examined patterns of skill improvement among teachers and patterns of academic achievement in Grades 3, 6, and 8.

During the 1989 session of the General Assembly, legislation granted all school districts in North Carolina the opportunity to begin participation in a new Performance-based Accountability Program. One of the optional features of the Program is a differentiated pay plan, designed by the local districts from a menu of options, including the pilot-tested Career Development Program.

Since the Performance-based Accountability Programs will be phased in over several years, the General Assembly authorized support of the Career Development Program pilot districts in

1989-90 at the 1988-89 level ($47 million), but allowed flexibility across funding categories. Pilot districts may redirect funds that previously had been in categories such as travel, staff, supplies, extra duties, and evaluators.

North Dakota

In 1986, a state model for in-service education and staff development was adopted. The model is designed to guide local districts in meeting the professional growth needs of teachers. A statewide conference was held again this fall for district personnel to discuss the model so that districts could continue to develop local policies for its implementation.

Ohio

In December 1984, the State Board of Education adopted the Master Plan for Excellence that called for the establishment of a career ladder and peer review program. The State Department of Education and Miami University conducted a study to determine the feasibility of implementing a statewide career ladder program. The study, completed in June 1987, suggested that districts should develop local incentive programs with state assistance using state-adopted basic guidelines. For the 1989-91 biennium, the legislature provided $2,080,000 to support pilot incentive projects in Toledo and Columbus. The Toledo project involves a career ladder with six levels after the initial qualification stage. The initial qualification is based upon five areas—letters of reference, a written essay, an interview before a three-member committee, a project, and six classroom observations by three mentor teachers. Movement further up the ladder requires classroom observation and additional assignments. Teachers may opt to remain at the third level of the ladder, which requires periodic observation to hold that position. The top two levels require a master's degree or graduate hours in an academic area.

The Cleveland school district is phasing in a locally financed four-level career ladder program beginning this year. Participating teachers and their principals will set goals at the beginning of the year; teachers will be paid extra based on their progress in meeting the goals. As planned, the career ladder will allow experienced teachers to earn up to $58,000 compared to a maximum of $44,600 for teachers not participating in the program.

In June 1989, the legislature authorized the Department of Education to continue study of merit pay and career ladder programs. The Department is to develop a plan to phase in career ladder programs statewide and submit it for legislative approval during the 1990-91 session.

Oklahoma

Legislation passed during the 1989 session called for the development of an Oklahoma Educational Indicators Program. The State Board of Education is "to develop and implement a system of measures whereby the performance of public schools and school districts is assessed and reported." Work is underway by the State Department of Education on an indicator project. The legislation also created *Task Force 2000: Creating Twenty-First Century Schools.* The task force was called upon to make recommendations on funding of education, new revenue sources, and to develop and review standards of progress. Legislative action on recommendations from the Task Force is pending.

The entry-year assistance program for beginning teachers provides guidance and assistance to all first-year teachers. Since the program began in 1982, over 10,000 teachers have gone through the process. A team consisting of a teacher consultant, a school administrator, and a faculty member from an insitution of higher education assists the teacher and makes a recommendation on certification. Teacher consultants are paid $500 and funds are appropriated to the institutions of higher education for faculty time.

Oregon

The 1987 legislature passed a bill providing for a professional development and school improvement program designed to address four areas: 1) the development of educational goals for

individual schools and districts; 2) the assessment of educational progress of school programs and students; 3) the professional growth and career opportunities for Oregon teachers; and 4) the restructuring of the school workplace to provide teachers with the responsibilities and authority commensurate with their status as professionals. For the 1987-89 biennium, $2.4 million was appropriated to support pilot projects developed by local committees at 70 schools across the state. Funds were allocated by providing $1,000 per teacher at each pilot site. For 1989-91, the legislature appropriated $4.6 million to continue this project and add additional sites; the pilot sites have been expanded to a total of 86 schools.

Within the same legislation, the Beginning Teacher Support Program was established to ensure that the induction of beginning teachers is conducive to professional growth and development. As outlined in the law, each district that qualifies to participate in the program will receive $3,000 to support each beginning teacher. Biennial funding was provided at a level of $3.9 million; 650 beginning teachers and their mentors will participate in the program each year of the biennium. Also established in 1987 was the Oregon Teacher Corps Program. Designed to encourage students to pursue teaching as a career, the program provides educational loans primarily to academically talented students, minority students, and students desiring to teach in remote locations or in shortage areas. $213,000 was appropriated for the 1989-91 biennium to continue this program.

Pennsylvania

In 1984-85 the State Department of Education awarded $4 million in grants to local districts for locally-developed efforts to improve instruction through training, to sponsor new programs developed by teachers, and to provide incentives for teachers. Nearly all of the state's 500 districts participated in the initial program, which received the same appropriation for 1985-86. For 1986-87 the state legislature increased the funding to $7 million; 67 of the districts developed incentive programs. Allocations were made after local districts submitted a written proposal for approval by the State Department of Education; funds were distributed according to a formula based on a pupil/teacher ratio.

With a change in the state administration, the scope of the program was modified for 1987-88—$4 million was appropriated for promoting effective teaching. Districts were awarded subsidy funding based upon a formula and could use the funds to support such programs as mentor teacher and continuing professional development. No funds were provided for incentive pay.

In 1988-89, the General Assembly appropriated $2 million for the continuing professional development of teachers. At the direction of the governor, the Department of Education has used $550,000 of these funds to create seven Lead Teacher Centers in diverse parts of the state. These centers will train 700 to 1,000 teachers annually to assume roles as instructional leaders in their schools. The remaining funds are supporting Lead Teacher development programs in half of the Commonwealth's 500 school districts.

Districts are required by law to implement school-based induction and professional development programs as a part of the state's certification requirements. Guidelines for these programs are provided by the Department of Education and districts submit their plans to the Department for approval. Funds are not earmarked specifically for these programs; districts use formula funds to carry out the state mandate.

Legislation passed in 1988 created the School Performance Incentive Program. In 1988-89, $5 million in state funds was awarded to 202 schools that qualified for incentive awards by showing significant improvement in at least one of three areas: student achievement in reading and mathematics, reducing the dropout rate, and preparing more high school students for higher education. Awards are made on the basis of the number of full-time teachers in the school—schools that meet the criteria in one of the three areas receive $611.81 per teacher. In 1988-89, five schools qualified in two of the three areas; those schools received double incentive payments. Incentive funds are re-invested into the school based on a plan developed by the staff at the school and approved by the school board. The governor has urged that the awards be

directed toward staff training, efforts to involve families more fully in the education of their children, creating a climate for learning in the schools, and developing business and community agency partnerships. For 1989-90, $5 million was again appropriated; however, the Department of Education may need to request supplemental funds since it appears that more schools are qualified for grants in the current year.

Rhode Island

Mentor teacher programs are being discussed in Rhode Island. The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education included in its 1989-90 budget request to the legislature a proposal for $225,000 to fund pilot mentor teacher projects in five districts; the funds were not provided.

The Department of Education held a two-day statewide conference in June 1989 entitled "Designing for the Future: A Beginning Teacher Induction Program." Educators and civic leaders came together to demonstrate that they share a common goal — improving the quality of education by ensuring that there are competent teachers in classrooms. Conference participants developed recommendations for the design of a beginning teacher induction program that were incorporated into a $250,000 proposal by the Department of Education to the U.S. Department of Education for monies provided by the Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching (FIRST). If funded, the Department will undertake a three-year project to enable several school districts to design model teacher education programs.

South Carolina

South Carolina legislation of 1984 established three incentive pilot programs. All have been expanded to statewide programs.

The School Incentive Reward Program. The School Incentive Reward Program is now beginning its fifth year. Legislation in 1989 made School Incentive Program awards (in two of three years) the primary criteria for granting flexibility to schools through deregulation. One-fourth of the 1,014 schools in the state received $3.9 million in rewards during 1988-89. Rewards are based on schools meeting criteria that include student achievement gain and improvement in student and teacher attendance. The achievement gain criterion must be met in order for a school to receive a reward; attendance rates qualify reward winners for additional funds. Schools meeting all criteria received $29.24 per pupil to be used for instructionally-related expenses. Schools also received flags and certificates signifying their reward status.

Individual student scores are tracked from one year to the next to determine progress. The student results are aggregated at the school level, and the top quarter of schools are rewarded in each of five comparison groups. The comparison groups are based on student backgrounds and school resources. Districts in which two-thirds of the schools were incentive winners receive an additional $2 per student. Vocational centers are eligible for rewards if their sending schools meet the student achievement criterion and the vocational center achieves three-year student placement rates of 50 percent or greater for 90 percent or more of their vocational programs. Two school districts and 21 centers received rewards in 1988-89.

The most recent survey of attitudes toward the program, conducted during the 1987-88 school year, found that most respondents regarded the program favorably: 90 percent of principals and teachers supported the concept of rewarding schools for achievement gains and 85 percent believed that goal-setting and hard work won awards.

South Carolina Principal Incentive Program. After three years of pilot testing, South Carolina's Principal Incentive Program is being implemented throughout the state in 1989-90. Funds of $1.35 million are available for incentive awards and program operation in 91 regular and 2 special school districts. Incentive awards for principals will range from a minimum of $2,500 to a maximum of $5,000.

The program continues to offer districts a choice of three models: Management by Results, Extended Evaluation, and a combination. Each model requires that principals demonstrate superior performance and productivity in comparison to other principals in the district. In addi-

tion, before receiving an incentive award, principals must achieve a performance evaluation rating that indicates a superior performance on South Carolina's statewide Principal Evaluation Program Instrument. Participation in the program by individual principals is voluntary. In 1988-89, the third year of the pilot testing, approximately 60 percent of the principals in 63 districts participated in the program.

Four external evaluation reports of South Carolina's Principal Incentive Program (PIP) have now been completed. These studies describe the principals' understanding and acceptance of the program, participation rates, the characteristics of incentive award recipients, and the relationship of incentive awards to other measures of superior performance and productivity. In the 1987-88 pilot test, the schools of those principals who received Principal Incentive Program awards exhibited greater student achievement gains, as measured by South Carolina's School Gain Index, than the schools of principals who did not receive awards or who did not participate. In addition, a relationship is evident between receiving an award in the Principal Incentive Program and receiving an award in South Carolina's School Incentive Program. Approximately 34 percent of the principals participating in the 1987-88 pilot test received incentive awards. These principals represented approximately 21 percent of all principals in the 63 participating districts. The external evaluation report assessing the outcomes of the 1987-88 pilot test concluded that "principals in all types of school, in all school groups, and of either sex had an equal opportunity to earn a PIP award."

The Teacher Incentive Program. This program, which started as a $2.2 million project in nine districts, has now become a $21.5 million statewide project. The program rewards teachers for superior performance and productivity. The 1984 law called on districts to develop models—a *bonus* plan, a *career ladder*, and a *campus/individual* plan. Districts then desiged programs according to the models. The *bonus* model rewards teachers for collective and individual efforts, superior performance in attendance, performance evaluation, student achievement, and self-improvement. The *campus/individual* model rewards teachers for collective and individual efforts within a school based on similar criteria. Based on recent recommendations of advisory groups, including teachers and legislators, the *career ladder* model has been phased out. It was believed that the *career ladder* model, as it was being implemented, depended too much on documenting extra activities or work. All models now have weighted criteria to emphasize performance and student achievement rather than other criteria, such as attendance or additional duties.

South Dakota

In 1985 the legislature enacted a career ladder for teachers and administrators, but implementation of the plan was blocked by a petition drive which, although not aimed at the career ladder, effectively thwarted the legislation of which it was a part. Originally, a three-level career ladder certification system would have been created. Provisions relating to only the first level in the original ladder have been retained.

Legislation passed in 1986 created a statewide induction program for first-year teachers and administrators. Under this program, first-year certificates were issued to new teachers and administrators. During the first year, each was assisted and evaluated by a team representing the local school district, higher education, and the South Dakota Department of Education. At the end of the year, the team either recommended full certification or another year in the induction program. For 1988-89, $300,000 in state funds were appropriated for this program. No state funding was provided for 1989-90; districts, however, may continue or initiate mentor programs with local funding.

Tennessee

The Career Ladder Program is in its sixth year of implementation as a statewide program. The 1989 legislature increased the funding for 1989-90 to $88 million, of which approximately $78 million is used for Career Ladder salary supplements and extended contract payments. An additional $14 million is allocated for retirement benefits for educators. The program includes a three-rung ladder for teachers (general education, vocational education, and special education), counselors, librarians, school psychologists, speech and language specialists, school social

workers, attendance supervisors, instructional supervisors, assistant principals, and principals. Salary supplements range from $1,000 to $7,000 according to the Career Ladder level and length of contract. Presently, 40,324 educators are on the ladder, with 8,329 teachers and administrators at the upper levels. Approximately 99 percent of all those eligible (educators in their first four years of teaching and some central office personnel are not) are on level I and about 28 percent are on the top two levels. Around 1,500 teachers and administrators have applied to be evaluated for the upper levels during 1989-90.

Teachers are evaluated by the local school district during their first four years and, if they are successful, receive a 10-year professional license. Educators may voluntarily seek Career Levels I, II, or III, based on evaluation of performance in the classroom or workplace and years of experience. Career Level I is determined by local district evaluation. Career Levels II and III may be determined by a three-member state evaluation team or an evaluation team composed of the teacher's principal and two state evaluators. The teacher may choose either evaluation model, but the principal and the teacher must both agree to the combination model.

Since 1989, educators who are not on the upper levels of the Career Ladder have been allowed to participate in the extended contract program. This program provides extra money to educators for additional work, primarily during the summer. A school district's extended contract program is based on student needs and may include adult literacy and extended school child care activities. This year, for the first time, educators who teach or administer in a public adult high school setting or in an Adult Basic Education Program are eligible for the Career Ladder.

Texas

1989-90 begins the sixth year of the Texas Teacher Career Ladder Program. During this year teachers who have advanced to, or have been maintained on, Level II will be receiving salary supplements ranging from $1,500 to $2,000; teachers at Level III will be paid a supplement ranging from $3,000 to $4,000. Decisions for advancement at either level are made by local districts on the basis of experience, job-related education (either formal higher education courses or clock hours of workshops), and, through use of the state appraisal system, performance in the classroom. Performance appraisals are used to determine if teachers remain at a level.

In 1988, the State Board of Education approved higher expectations in scoring standards for the upper two categories in the state appraisal system — "exceeding expectations" and "clearly outstanding." For the 1989-90 school year the program is funded through state allocations based on a formula per average daily student attendance (ADA). The 1989 legislature increased the funding from $70 per ADA to $90 per ADA in fiscal year 1990. The scheduled implementation of Level IV (Master Teacher) has been delayed from 1989-90 to 1991-92. The state is developing an expanded teacher appraisal system to include measures for evaluating the different roles that would be assumed by master teachers.

Utah

In 1989-90, the fourth year of the Career Ladder Program in Utah, funding was at the same level ($41 million), despite fiscal cutbacks in the state. District-designed plans have been developed using guidelines from legislation passed in 1984. Several districts have received multi-year approval of their programs for up to 3 years by submitting long-range master plans. It is hoped that all districts will be granted multi-year approval in the future.

The Career Ladder program has four major parts: career ladder, performance bonus, job enlargement, and extended contract day. The performance bonus part of the program recognizes and rewards excellence in the classroom; job enlargement provides extra pay for extra work; and extended days provides for paid non-teaching days beyond the regular school year. (The average is around six and one-half days.) The law places a cap of 50 percent of funding on extended contract days and many districts are increasing the proportion of their funds toward the 50 percent.

A comprehensive third-party evaluation, completed in 1988, recommended certain refinements in the program, many of which have been addressed through local school board

rules. The State Office of Education is planning to request full funding for the Career Ladder Program for 1990-91 as recommended in the evaluation report; this would add $19 million to the current funding. Additionally the office will request that the legislature allow groups of teachers (such as those in a school's science department) to apply for performance bonuses; currently, teachers can only apply individually.

In 1989-90, six districts have received their career ladder funding in a "block grant" allocation, free from the normal program requirements. A third-party evaluation of the districts' ability to attract and retain teachers will be conducted next year.

Vermont

As a part of new certification regulations adopted by the State Board of Education, the 23-member Standards Board for Professional Educators was created. A majority of the board members are teachers; the remaining members are local district and school administrators, district school board members, and representatives from higher education. The board has been asked to recommend a plan for implementing a teacher mentoring program to the State Board of Education by July 1990.

Virginia

Virginia has proposed an Educational Performance Recognition Program. The program is designed to improve student learning by focusing the accountability in public schools on outcomes. Accreditation standards will be focused on results, rather than the current focus on courses, programs, or library circulations. Schools that are the highest performing will be rewarded and programs will be available to assist schools that are not. Results in improved student achievement, percent of high school students receiving advanced high school diplomas, or graduation rates of vocational students will be used as indicators. As part of Virginia's agenda for the 1990s, as reported in *Virginia's Public Schools*, once Virginia reaches the national average for teacher salaries (expected in 1990), that should be considered the floor. State funding in the 1990s to move beyond the national average should "recognize teacher effort and accomplishment. . . Career Ladders should be established that reward teachers for assuming more responsibility and doing extra work." (In 1986, the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education recommended that financial incentives be provided for keeping effective teachers in the classroom.)

Fairfax County Schools implemented a new teacher performance and pay-for-performance plan. The plan includes professional growth opportunities, recognizes outstanding teaching, assists beginning teachers, and links pay to performance. The plan includes a three-step career ladder. The teacher performance evaluation system was piloted and phased in for all schools during the 1987-88 school year. A teacher may move to Career Level I after three years of classroom experience and an "effective" rating. Teachers may reach Levels II and III by achieving ratings of "skillful" or "exemplary" on their evaluations. The evaluation process includes peer and supervisor review and self assessment on goals.

During 1984-86, Master Teacher and Pay-for-Performance programs were piloted. Outside consultants reviewed the plans and reported that, despite problems with communications, pay-for-performance programs can work. The State Board of Education endorsed the concept. A survey in 1987 of 136 public school districts showed that 13 districts were conducting teacher incentive programs. Districts developed different approaches and purposes. Half the plans used student achievement as one of many criteria and it is the sole criterion in two plans.

Legislation in 1988 established a Clinical Faculty Program for the training of classroom teachers to supervise and evaluate student teachers. Teachers receive stipends. Criteria for training programs were established by the Council for Higher Education in cooperation with the State Board of Education.

Washington

The Teacher Assistance Program, now in its fifth year, is operating with an appropriation of $3.7 million for the 1989-91 biennium. Currently, 1,000 teams of one mentor and one teacher or other educational personnel (such as counselors, nurses, and school phychologists) are being supported. Beginning personnel are involved in 900 of the teams; the remaining 100 pair an experienced person (for example, a teacher re-entering the profession or one who is changing subject areas) with a mentor.

A program initiated last year, Schools for the 21st Century, provides grants to schools to develop innovative programs. There were 135 applications for the 6-year grants; 21 schools have received grants from $3.5 million appropriated for 1988-90. The proposals were developed at the school level with parent, teacher, and administrative input. The grants may be used, for example, to purchase equipment and supplies, provide in-service training for instructional staff, and pay staff for working additional days (all of the proposals added at least 10 days to the teachers' school year). There is variation in the funded proposals and schools were permitted to request exemptions from normal state regulations. One proposal, for example, reduced the traditional 5-day week for students to 4 days, designating the fifth day for in-service training for teachers. The school year was extended through July and services for the "extended learning family" (birth through adult) were incorporated into the school program.

West Virginia

The State Board of Education established guidelines for a Distinguished Teacher Program, which would have enabled districts to develop models for recognizing teachers who demonstrated excellent teaching performance. No funding was provided for the program.

Ashland Oil Company has established a $50,000 program to reward five teachers and five teams of instructors in the state each year. State citizens nominate teachers, and a panel of teachers and administrators choose the winners. Teachers receive $2,000 and may receive up to $3,000 to take additional college courses. Each of the teams receives a $2,000 award, with $3,000 for materials for a project of their design. Projects are team teaching projects that might be replicated in other schools.

Wisconsin

In 1985-86, the Wisconsin State Department of Education issued guidelines and standards to be used in the development of local district proposals for teacher incentive pilot programs. These pilots could include awards, career ladder, or first-year assistance programs for beginning teachers. Funding of $1 million was provided for the initial two-year period (1985-87). Eight proposals, involving 35 to 40 local districts, were initially funded and continued their pilots in 1987-88, with a one-year extension of funding at a level of $214,000. No further funding has been provided. However, 140 to 150 of the state's 432 districts are operating first-year assistance programs with local funds; another 100 districts are looking into establishing mentor programs. The Department of Education is encouraging the local districts and teacher representatives to incorporate mentor programs into teacher contracts.

Wyoming

Although there was some discussion in 1984 relative to the consideration of merit in teacher compensation, no statewide action has been taken. Local districts have the flexibility to initiate teacher improvement programs; however, Wyoming's economic condition is hindering local efforts to do so.

State information compiled by Gale F. Gaines, Research Associate, and Lynn M. Cornett, Vice President for State Services, SREB.

1989 State Contacts

Alabama — Mary N. Hogan, Coordinator of Leadership and Management Improvement Program, Gordon Persons Building, 50 North Ripley Street, Montgomery, AL 36130-3901 (205) 242-9833

Alaska — Ray Minge, Program Manager, State Department of Education, PO Box F, Juneau, AK 99881 (907) 465-2824

Arizona — Louann Bierlein, Assistant Director, Education Studies, Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-4405 (602) 965-4525; Michelle Blain, House Education Analyst, 1700 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007 (602) 542-1989

Arkansas — Kathy Van Laningham, Education Liaison, Office of the Governor, State Capitol, Little Rock, AR 72201 (501) 682-2345

California — Jane Holzmann, Educational Program Consultant, Office of Staff Development, State Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA 94244-2720 (916) 322-0870

Colorado — Wayne Martin, Director, Program for Educational Quality (303) 866-6853; Carol Ruckel, Assistant to the Director, Program for Educational Quality (303) 866-6853; Colorado Department of Education, 201 East Colfax Avenue, Denver, CO 80203

Connecticut — Richard Vaillancourt, Consultant, Division of Curriculum and Professional Development, State Department of Education, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106 (203) 566-5750

Delaware — William J. McCormick, State Director of Professional Development and Certification, Department of Public Instruction, Townsend Building, PO Box 1402, Dover, DE 19903 (302) 736-2768

Florida — Larry D. Hutcheson, Chief, Bureau of Program Support Services, State Department of Education, Florida Education Center, Room 844, Tallahassee, FL 32399 (904) 488-5270

Georgia — David Watts, Policy Coordinator, Office of Planning and Budget, 270 Washington Street SW, Atlanta, GA 30334 (404) 656-3800; Stephen M. Preston, Director, Division of Personnel Development, 1862 Twin Towers East, 205 Butler Street, Atlanta, GA 30334-5030 (404) 656-2008

Hawaii — Ronald K. Toma, Personnel Specialist, State Department of Education, PO Box 2360, Honolulu, HI (808) 548-5215

Idaho — Michael L. Friend, Supervisor, Teacher Education and Certification, State Department of Education, Len B. Jordan Office Building, 650 West State Street, Boise, ID 83720 (208) 334-4713

Illinois — Susan K. Bentz, Assistant Superintendent, Illinois State Board of Education, 100 North First S-306, Springfield, IL 62777 (217) 782-3774

Indiana — George Stuckey, Director of Teacher Quality and Professional Improvement, State Department of Education, Center for Professional Development, Room 229, State House, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798 (317) 232-9010

Iowa — Edith Eckles, Consultant, Bureau of School Administration and Accreditation, State Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146 (515) 281-5332

Kansas — Dale M. Dennis, Deputy Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, 120 East Tenth Street, Topeka, KS 66612 (913) 296-3871

Kentucky — Roger Pankratz, College of Education, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY 42101 (502) 745-4662

Louisiana — Leilani Urbatsch, Education Program Manager, Bureau of Evaluation and Analytical Services, State Department of Education, PO Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064 (504) 342-3734

Maine — Mary E. Robinson, Director, Division of Certification and Placement (207) 289-5944; Edwin N. Kastuck, Certification Specialist, Division of Certification and Placement (207) 289-5944; Maine Department of Educational and Cultural Services, State House Station #23, Augusta, ME 04333

Maryland — Shelley Clemson, Specialist, Teacher Recruitment, State Department of Education, 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, MD 21201 (301) 333-3019

Massachusetts — Susan Zelman, Associate Commissioner (617) 770-7505; Cindy Morrell, Administrative Assistant (617) 770-7618; State Department of Education, 1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA 02169

Michigan — C. Danford Austin, State Director, Teacher/Administrator Preparation and Certification Services (517) 373-1926; Saundra Carter, Higher Education Consultant, Teacher/Administration Preparation and Certification Services (517) 335-4610 or 373-3310, State Department of Education, PO Box 30008, Lansing, MI 48909

Minnesota — Kenneth L. Peatross, Executive Secretary, Board of Teaching, 550 Cedar Street, 608 Capitol Square Building, St. Paul, MN 55101 (612) 296-2415

Mississippi — Bob Cheeseman, State Department of Education, PO Box 771, Jackson, MS 39205 (601) 359-3768

Missouri — Barbara Taylor, Supervisor, Urban and Teacher Education (314) 751-1191; Celeste Ferguson, Assistant Commissioner, Urban and Teacher Education (314) 751-2931; State Department of Education, PO Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102

Montana — Claudette Morton, Executive Secretary of the Board of Public Education, 33 Last Chance Gulch, Helena, MT 59620 (406) 444-6576

Nebraska — Robert Crosier, Director, Teacher Education/Certification (402) 471-2496; Russ Inbody (402) 471-4320; State Department of Education, PO Box 94987, Lincoln, NE 68509

Nevada — Marcia R. Bandera, Deputy Superintendent, Administrative and Fiscal Services, State Department of Education, 400 West King Street, Carson City, NV 89710 (702) 885-3106

New Hampshire — Joanne Baker, Administrator; Alexander Blostos, Assistant Administrator; Bureau of Teacher Education and Professional Standards, State Department of Education, 101 Pleasant Street, Concord, NH 03301 (603) 271-2407

New Jersey — Richard A. DiPatri, Assistant Commissioner (609) 292-6874; Gary T. Reece, Director of Special Projects (609) 984-8283; Division of Educational Programs, State Department of Education, 225 West State Street, CN 500, Trenton, NJ 08625-0500

New Mexico — Susan Brown, Planning Council Coordinator, State Department of Education, Education Building, Santa Fe, NM 87501-2786 (505) 827-6581

New York — Charles C. Mackey, Jr., Chief, Teacher Certification Policy, Office for the Teaching Professions (518) 474-6440; Helen Hartle, Chief, Staff Development Unit, Office for the Teaching Professions (518) 473-1234; State Education Department, Albany, NY 12230

North Carolina — Robert D. Boyd, Director; David Holdzkom, Chief Consultant; Division of LEA Personnel Services, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 116 W. Edenton Street, Raleigh, NC 27603 (919) 733-9230

North Dakota — Ordean M. Lindemann, Director of Teacher Certification, Department of Public Instruction, Bismarck, ND 58505 (701) 223-4407

Ohio — V. Randall Flora, Assistant Director (614) 466-0308; Charles W. Bridges, Consultant (614) 466-3593; Teacher Education and Certification Division, State Department of Education, Room 1012, Columbus, OH 43266-0308

Oklahoma — Sharon A. Lease, Special Assistant to the State Superintendent (405) 521-4311; Billie English, Director, Staff Development/Entry Year/Teacher Evaluation (405) 521-3607; State Department of Education, 2500 N. Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4599

Oregon — Joyce M. Reinke, Director of Personnel Development, State Department of Education, 700 Pringle Parkway, SE, Salem, OR 97301 (503) 373-7118

Pennsylvania — Timothy Potts, Deputy Chief of Staff, Department of Education, 333 Market Street, Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333 (717) 787-9744

Rhode Island — Edward L. Dambruch, Assistant Commissioner (401) 277-6887; Eloise L. Boyer, Education Specialist III (401) 277-2046; State Department of Education, 22 Hayes Street, Providence, RI 02908

South Carolina — Deborah D. Fite, State Coordinator, Teacher Incentive Program, Room 504-B (803) 734-8217; Jim F. Casteel, Supervisor, School Incentive Program, Room 701 (803) 734-8277; Alex Sergienko, Coordinator, Principal Incentive Program, Room 507-B (803) 734-8212; State Department of Education, Rutledge Building, 1429 Senate Street, Columbia, SC 29201

South Dakota — Donna Fjelstad, Assistant to State Superintendent, 700 Governor's Drive, Pierre, SD 57501 (605) 773-3243

Tennessee — Frances Prince, Assistant Commissioner, Career Ladder Division; Betty McCowan, Executive Director, State Certification Commission; State Department of Education, 542 Cordell Hull Building, Nashville, TN 37219 (615) 741-7816

Texas — Richard E. Swain III, Assistant Commissioner, Career Ladder Division, Room 111 (512) 463-9328; Linda Haynes, Director, Division of Teacher Education (512) 463-9332; Texas Education Agency, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701

Utah — Cristi Denler, Education Specialist (801) 538-7820 or 7804; Larry Horyna, Coordinator (801) 538-7821 or 7824; Project Assistance Services, Utah State Office of Education, 250 East 500 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Vermont — Doug Walker, Director, Basic Education (802) 828-3111; Ken Bergstrom, Licensing Standards Specialist (802) 828-2444; State Department of Education, 120 State Street, Montpelier, VT 05602

Virginia — Thomas A. Elliott, Administrative Director, Teacher Education, State Department of Education, PO Box 6Q, Richmond, VA 23832 (804) 225-2094

Washington — Don Johnson (206) 586-6906, Ted Andrews (206) 753-3222, *Mentor Teacher Program*; John Anderson, *Schools for the 21st Century* (206) 586-4512; Department of Public Instruction, Old Capitol Building, Olympia, WA 98504

West Virginia — Howard Kardatzke, Acting Director, Office of Professional Education (304) 348-7826; James R. Lewellen, Unit Coordinator, Office of Professional Education (304) 348-2703; State Department of Education, Building 6, Room B-337, Charleston, WV 25304

Wisconsin — Kathryn Lind, Director, Beginning Teacher Assistance, Department of Public Instruction, 125 S. Webster, Madison, WI 53707 (608) 266-1788

Wyoming — Lyall Hartley, Director, Certification/Licensing, State Department of Education, Cheyenne, WY 82002 (307) 777-6261